



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

nl

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,829	07/14/2003	Douglas B. Meyer	5681-41100	5944
35690	7590	02/14/2007	EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. 700 LAVACA, SUITE 800 AUSTIN, TX 78701			ROMANO, JOHN J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2192
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/14/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/618,829	Applicant(s) MEYER ET AL.
	Examiner John J. Romano	Art Unit 2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 14th, 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on July 14th, 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/23/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in this action.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 23rd, 2003 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Independent claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A “carrier medium” is defined in the specification as including transmission media or signal (see specification, page 30, lines 25-26). A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus a signal does not fall within any of the four statutory classes of 101. See Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, Annex IV (c), (signed 26, October, 2005) – OG Cite: 1300 OG 142. Retrieve on
<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005/week47/patgupa.htm>>.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: The specification, page 2, paragraph [0023] refers to "a service processor 113", wherein the "113" label is not included in Figure 1. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15-21, 23, 25, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowell et al., US 2004/0215440 (hereinafter **Crowell**) in view of Huang et al., US 5,267,246 (hereinafter **Huang**).

In regard to claim 16, **Crowell** discloses:

- *"A computer system comprising: a system processor configured to execute instructions associated with user software; a client coupled to said system processor via a system interconnect; and a service processor coupled to said system processor and to said client via a... bus, wherein said service processor is configured to execute application software for configuring said computer system into one or more domains and for performing diagnostics; wherein said service processor is further configured to..."* (E.g., see Figure 1 & paragraphs [0023] + [0027]), wherein a system comprising a service processor 113, system processor(s) 112, other networked computers 146 (client) for configuring one or more hardware components is taught.
- *"...access an executable form of program instructions for manipulating said system processor and said client from one consistent state to a next consistent state..."* (E.g., see Figure 2 & [0043]), wherein the firmware is loaded 206 to configure the hardware state.
- *"...wherein said program instructions describe a sequence of one or more transactions for manipulating said system processor and said client..."* (E.g., see Figure 1 & paragraph [0022]), wherein smart

buffers may call specialized functions to capture the cause and effect behavior (manipulate) of the actual registers of the targeted hardware, wherein the firmware is any set of executable code designed to interface with (e.g., read, write, modify) the hardware components.

- “*... wherein said program instructions call one or more code segments that include specific information associated with said system processor and said client and wherein said program instructions are independent of said specific information...*” (E.g., see Figure 2 & paragraph [0035]), wherein a library of behavior definitions 134 based on the hardware specifications 136 develop behavioral models 204 which describe at the bit level the effect of modifying one register (e.g., control register) has on another register (e.g., a corresponding status register).
- “*... and execute said executable form of said program instructions in response to executing said application software.*” (E.g., see Figure 2 & paragraph [0045]), wherein the firmware code is executed to configure hardware (modify the registers), wherein paragraph [0025] additionally teaches translation and execution of the sequence of instructions.

But **Crowell** does not expressly disclose “maintenance bus” in a diagnostic environment. However, **Huang** discloses a maintenance bus via a support processor in order to test a system (Column 2, lines 4-15). **Crowell** and **Huang** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, testing and configuration of a system with a service processor. Therefore, at the time the invention

was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Huang's** service processor with **Crowell's** configuration process. The motivation to do so would have been to provide a system support adapter (SSA) between the service processor and the main processor which functions to interrogate the system as taught by **Huang** (E.g., see Column 2, lines 4-8).

In regard to claim 17, the rejections of base claim 16 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- *“...include one or more respective control registers, wherein said respective control registers include one or more bits configured to control and indicate an operating state of said system processor and said client.”* (E.g., see Figure 1 & paragraph [0021]), wherein the firmware is any set of executable code designed to interface with (e.g., read, write, modify) the hardware components corresponding to registers (e.g., status, control, and results registers) in the actual targeted hardware.

But **Crowell** and **Huang** do not expressly disclose “each include”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to configure each and every processor included in a system that was modified or changed in order to perform complete diagnostics.

In regard to claim 18, the rejections of base claim 17 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- *“...to read and write information within said one or more respective control registers of said system processor and said client.”* (E.g., see Figure 2 & paragraph [0035]), wherein behavioral models 204 which describe at the bit level the effect of modifying one register (e.g., control register) has on another register (e.g., a corresponding status register) is diagnosed by the firmware.

In regard to claim 19, the rejections of base claim 16 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- *“...include one or more state machine implementations each including a plurality of states and wherein said plurality of states are effected in response to invocation of said one or more code segments.”* (E.g., see Figure 2 & paragraph [0035]), wherein behavioral models 204 which describe at the bit level the effect of modifying one register (e.g., control register) has on another register (e.g., a corresponding status register) is diagnosed by the firmware, wherein the behavioral models are described in the sequence of code called in the special functions and attached to the smart buffers (208).

But **Crowell** and **Huang** do not expressly disclose “each include”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to configure each and every processor included in a system that was modified or changed in order to perform complete diagnostics.

In regard to claim 20, the rejections of base claim 16 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...said specific information includes control register-specific information.*” (E.g., see Figure 2 & paragraph [0035]), wherein behavioral models 204 which describe at the bit level the effect of modifying one register (e.g., control register).

In regard to claim 21, the rejections of base claim 20 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...a control register name.*” (E.g., see Figure 1 & paragraph [0035]), wherein chip A has a Control Register (A_REG_C).

In regard to claim 23, the rejections of base claim 21 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...a control register field including one or more particular bits.*” (E.g., see Figure 1 & Paragraph [0038]), wherein the firmware code 118 sets bit 0 of Control Register (A_REG_C:0).

In regard to claim 25, the rejections of base claim 16 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...specific information associated with said system processor and said client is derived from an output of a design tool, wherein said output corresponds to a hardware definition language representation of said system processor and said client.*” (E.g., see paragraph [0007]), wherein output of a design tool (VHDL) corresponds to a hardware

definition language representation of said system processor and said client.

In regard to claim **26**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...said program instructions include specifying an access operation on a control register without defining a specific bus route for conveying said operation.*” (E.g., see Figure 4A + 4B) & paragraph [0037]), wherein an access operation on a control register without a specific bus route is defined.

In regard to claim **28**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Crowell** discloses:

- “*...written in a descriptive abstract programming language.*” (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 12, lines 16-29), wherein.

But **Crowell** and **Huang** do not expressly disclose “*not directly compilable*”.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to write the general behavioral definitions in pseudo-code (not directly compilable) as is old and well known in the art, in light of teaching of any abstract programming language such as that taught by **Crowell** as addressed above.

In regard to claims **1-5, 7, 9, 10, and 12**, this is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **16, 18-21, 23, 25, 26** and **28**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Crowell** (paragraph [0009]), wherein a method is disclosed.

In regard to claim **15**, this is a computer readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above, in claim **16**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Crowell** (Figure 1) wherein a computer readable medium is disclosed.

6. Claims **6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 22, 24, 27, 29** and **30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Crowell et al.**, US 2004/0215440 (hereinafter **Crowell**) in view of **Huang et al.**, US 5,267,246 (hereinafter **Huang**) and further in view of "The Design and Evolution of C++" by Bjarne Stroustrup (hereinafter "C++").

In regard to claims **22**, the rejections of base claim **21** are incorporated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include a string literal representation of a number evaluated as an integer value and translate that into an ascii character representation of said integer in light of old and well known object oriented principles and programming practices in order to achieve the known benefits of such languages. (E.g., see **C++**, pgs 158-159). Therefore, it would have been obvious to "*...program instructions include specifying said control register name using an integer arithmetic expression that is evaluated as an integer value and translated into a character representation of said integer value.*" Further motivation to combine object oriented principles with **Crowell** and **Huang's** method was suggested by **Crowell's** disclosure of hardware modeling (E.g., see Figure 2, box 136 + 134).

In regard to claims **24** and **27**, the rejections of base claims **23** and **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

at the time the invention was made to store a value in a storage variable and have that value accessible by subsequent instructions, (E.g., see **C++**, pgs 158-159). Thus, it would have been obvious to "*...include storing a value in a storage variable during a transaction, wherein said value is accessible by an instruction executed subsequent to completion of said transaction.*"

In regard to claim **29**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to correspond different objects modeled with unique classes and unique names with an appropriate extension appended in light of old and well known object oriented principles and programming practices. (E.g., see **C++**, pgs 316-325). Therefore, it would have been obvious to "*...said specific information associated with particular hardware components is derived from a computer information model (CIM) representation by associating each particular hardware component with a CIM class having a CIM class name and creating, for each CIM class, a corresponding unique type by appending "_cim_t" to said CIM class name.*"

In regard to claim **30**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have different classes call the same method in light of old and well known object oriented principles and programming practices. (E.g., see **C++**, pgs 316-325). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include "*...a hardware function programming interface type is specified that corresponds to a particular partition of functionality within a given hardware component type, wherein two identically named code segments have*

a substantially same semantic effect and different implementations when called by two different hardware function programming interfaces."

In regard to claims **6, 8, 11, 13, and 14**, this is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **22, 24, 27, 29 and 30**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see **Crowell** (paragraph [0009]), wherein a method is disclosed.

Conclusion

7. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Urs et al., US 6,148,204, wherein method for utilizing a distributed location control register on multiple devices in a network is taught.
- Terry, US 7,095,718, wherein client/server jtag scan software test a device via scan techniques remotely.
- Powell, et al., US 2002/0183997, wherein a method for specifying the configuration of mixed-language simulation models is disclosed.
- Wakabayashi et al., US 2003/010477, wherein VHDL representation of a test bench is disclosed with manipulation of a control register via read and write commands via a master bus and DMA controller.
- Maciona et al., US 6,941,243, wherein a high-level descriptive hardware language is converted into low level testing language for building and testing systems.

- Becker et al., "An Engineering Environment for Hardware/Software Co-Simulation" discloses hardware/software co-simulation.
- Bauer et al., "Hardware/Software Co-Simulation in a VHDL-based Test Bench Approach" discloses calling hardware specific functions via a master controller with a hierarchy encompassing all levels of testing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJR



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER